

**Sonoma 101 Widening & Soundwall Construction (Wilfred to Route 12)
Final Negative Declaration/Final Environmental Assessment**

COMMENT #26 - LETTER (page 1 of 2)

To: Kathleen McBride/D04/Caltrans/CAGov

Cc:

Subject Initial Study/ Environmental Assessment comments

:

Attached are comments from the City of Santa Rosa Department of Public Works regarding the Initial Study/Environmental Assessment for "Highway 101 Widening and Soundwall Construction in Sonoma County from the Wilfred Avenue Interchange to the Route 101/12 Separation." All but the last two comments are from the City's Traffic Engineer, Gene Benton. The last two are from Ed Baker, a Supervising Engineer in the Engineering Division. For questions or more information regarding the comments, please contact Gene Benton at (707) 543-3815 or Ed Baker at (707) 543-3841.

Thank you.

Ed Baker

City of Santa Rosa Department of Public Works

<<us101comments.wpd>>



- us101comments.wpd

**Sonoma 101 Widening & Soundwall Construction (Wilfred to Route 12)
Final Negative Declaration/Final Environmental Assessment**

COMMENT #26 - LETTER (page 2 of 2)

US 101 Widening from Santa Rosa Avenue to Highway 12 - Comments on Initial Study/Environmental Assessment from the City of Santa Rosa Department of Public Works

Intersection of Hearn Avenue/Corby Avenue - On the west leg of the intersection there exists a median island with its purpose of preventing left turns in and out of the Service Station Driveways nearest to the intersection both on the north and south sides of the street. The median island provides better capacity at the intersection, produces a safer intersection and should be retained. The length of the median island should allow for left turns at the westerly driveways at both Service Stations.

A

Intersection of Santa Rosa Avenue/Baker Avenue/Colgan Avenue - The intersection presently has northbound dual left turn lanes from Santa Rosa Avenue to Baker Avenue. Two lanes are needed on the westbound to north Baker Avenue ramps to accommodate the dual left turn lanes.

B

Intersection of Santa Rosa Avenue/Baker Avenue Overcrossing - The report indicates the removal of the eastbound free right turn. This removal would have a major negative impact on the capacity of the intersection that could result in traffic substantially backing up over the bridge and would affect the off-ramp. It is suggested that a free right turn be retained that connects with the storage ramps for the westbound to north Baker Avenue ramp and a eastbound dual left turn be included.

C

Additionally, there has been a request in the recent past (and probably another request will occur in the future) to allow the driveway on the east side of Santa Rosa to have signalized access to the intersection. The design needs to ensure that future modifications to the traffic signal will allow this signalized access.

Intersection of Santa Rosa Avenue/Hearn Avenue - A development is being proposed on the east side of the intersection that will require signalized access through the intersection. The design of the traffic signal modifications should allow for a future connection of the driveway through the signalized intersection.

D

Regional Water Quality Control Board - Page 23 of the IS/EA indicates that the NPDES program is implemented locally by the San Francisco RWQCB and that Caltrans has a permit from the RWQCB covering roadways in the Bay Area. However, Santa Rosa is within the jurisdiction of the North Coast RWQCB.

E

Soundwalls - Page 25 of the IS/EA, under "Noise and Vibration," states: "Although the traffic noise analysis for this project identified 15 potential soundwall locations, 14 are proposed to be installed due to cost considerations." More information should be included regarding the one potential soundwall location at which a wall is not proposed to be installed, and the reasons for excluding it. What is it about that location that makes the cost prohibitive?

F

**Sonoma 101 Widening & Soundwall Construction (Wilfred to Route 12)
Final Negative Declaration/Final Environmental Assessment**

RESPONSE #26 - LETTER

Ed Baker -- City of Santa Rosa Department of Public Works

Comment Number	Response
26-A	Intersection of Hearn Avenue/Corby Avenue - The median island at this intersection will be retained, and the length of the median island will allow for left turns at the westerly driveways at both Service Stations.
26-B	Intersection of Santa Rosa Avenue/Baker Avenue/Colgan Avenue - Two lanes on the westbound to north Baker Avenue ramps will be incorporated into the project.
26-C	<p>a) Intersection of Santa Rosa Avenue/Baker Avenue Overcrossing -- At this intersection, two left-turn lanes as well as two right turn lanes will be provided (eastbound on the Baker Avenue Overcrossing). The Santa Rosa Avenue southbound shoulder will be a storage lane for the Baker Avenue northbound on-ramp; ramp metering is proposed at this on-ramp.</p> <p>b)The electrical plans will take into account that there will be future modifications at these intersections. The electrical equipment will be placed to ensure that minimal modifications to the traffic signal equipment will be required when the modifications do take place.</p>
26-D	Intersection of Santa Rosa Avenue/Hearn Avenue - the traffic signal modifications at this intersections will allow for a future connection of the driveway through the signalized intersection
26-E	<p>Regional Water Quality - The statement on page 23 of the IS/EA is incorrect. Under Section 5 Question VIII of the ND/Final Environmental Assessment, a new section will read:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Discharges to waters of the U.S. are regulated under the NPDES permitting program. Construction sites that will disturb 2 or more hectares of soil or that are within a water sensitive area must adhere to the conditions of the statewide Caltrans NPDES Permit CAS #000003, Order #99-06-DWQ, issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). Adherence to the compliance requirements of the NPDES General Permit CAS #000002, Order #99-08-DWQ, for General Construction Activities is also required.</p>
26-F	Soundwalls are constructed only if they are determined to be "reasonable" and feasible". In regard to the soundwall not proposed to be installed, it was found that the soundwall was not cost effective. Projects are considered to be cost effective if they cost no more than the criterion established for each residential unit protected by the barrier. The cost effectiveness criterion was established as \$35,000 for the 1996 and 1997 calendar years. Using \$35,000 as the cost effectiveness criterion for 1998, placing the soundwall would cost more than 3.5 times per unit. Thus, the soundwall not being cost effective was taken out of the project.